UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/370,178	08/09/1999	BIN LI	RO4474	7728

20779	7590	12/31/2003

SHAPIRO COHEN
P.O. BOX 3440
STATION D
OTTAWA, ON K1P6P1
CANADA

EXAMINER
CHANG, EDITH M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2634	12

DATE MAILED: 12/31/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.		Applicant(s)
	09/370,178		LI ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit
	Edith M Chang		2634

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 November 2003*.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.   6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 1-11, & 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Blaker et al. (US5550870) in view of Hladik et al. (U.S. Patent 5721745).

Regarding **claims 1 & 8**, except explicitly specify the vector representation of

probabilities, Blaker et al. discloses all subject matter: a method of processing

information/decoding q-ary encoded information symbols where q is a plural integer (column 7

lines 10-12, where the symbol is 8 bit), using a soft output Viterbi algorithm (Abstract),

comprising the steps of:

(a) determining a probability of reaching the state via each transition path, and a total

probability of reaching the state (column 9 lines 5-10 wherein the symbol contains probability

components, column 3 lines 42-50, column 3 line 55-column 4 line 5); and

(b) providing at least probabilities for respective symbol values for reaching the state by

summing products of the probability of reaching the state via the respective paths with respective

elements of vectors provided for previous states from which the state can be reached via the

respective paths (column 4 lines 2-20); and

(c) providing a probability for each information symbol from respective elements of the

at least one vector for all of the possible states of the trellis for a respective symbol time (column

4 lines 45-46).

Where the (a), (b), and (c) for each and every path (column 3 lines 42-49, where the

Viterbi decoder starts at the starting point/state and considers all possible state combinations/

Paths that includes steps a, b, and c), and (b) and (c) for each and every symbol (column 3 lines

55-67, column 4 lines 45-47, wherein the path metric calculates for each symbol instant, the (b)

and (c) are steps of path metric).

However Hladik et al. teaches the vector representation of probabilities/the likelihood

ratios for SOVA (column 3 line 50-column 4 line 5, column 4 line 40-column 5 line 15, column

9 lines 25-40). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary

skill in the art to have the representation of probabilities/ likelihood ratios taught by Hladik et al.

in Blaker et al.'s method as a typical SOVA calculation (column 4 lines 66-67) and to gain

computational advantages (column 5 lines 7-8).

Regarding **claim 4**, Blaker et al. discloses the symbol values have a plurality of q values

and one vector of probabilities for respective symbol values comprises q probabilities (column 7

lines 11-14, Table 1, column 4 lines 39-41 & lines 60-63, where MLSE estimates the digital data

sequence having the maximum probabilities of transmission using the Viterbi algorithm).

Regarding **claims 2, 5-6, & 9**, Blaker et al. does not specify the probability ratios and

logarithmic probabilities, however Hladik et al. teaches probability ratios (column 5 lines 1-7)

and logarithmic probabilities (column 5 lines 7-11) for the binary values. At the time of the

invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have the

probability ratio/ logarithmic probabilities taught by Hladik et al. in Blaker et al.'s method as typical SOVA calculation (column 4 lines 66-67) and to gain computational advantages (column 5 lines 7-8).

Regarding **claims 3 & 10**, <u>Blaker et al.</u> does not specify the probability ratios for q values, however <u>Hladik et al.</u> teaches probability ratios (column 4 line 66- column 5 line 7) for the symbol with plurality values, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have the probability ratios taught by Hladik et al. in Blaker et al.'s method in the one vector for each state comprising at least q-1 vectors of probability rations as typical SOVA calculation (column 4 lines 66-67) and to gain computational advantages (column 5 lines 7-8).

Regarding **claim 7**, <u>Blaker et al.</u> does not specify two vectors of probabilities, however <u>Hladik et al.</u> teaches two vectors of probabilities, one for each of the binary values (column 4 lines 11-13, column 5 lines 6-7). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have the vectors of probabilities of binary symbols taught by Hladik et al. in Blaker et al.'s method where receiving series of binary data (column 3 lines 49-50 '870) to have more efficient computation.

Regarding **claim 11**, <u>Blaker et al.</u> does not specify providing logarithmic probability rations, however <u>Hladin et al.</u> teaches the logarithmic probability ratios (column 4 line 66- column 5 line 15). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have the probability logarithmic probabilities taught by Hladik et al. in Blaker et al.'s method to gain computational advantages (column 5 lines 7-8).

Regarding **claims 14 & 16,** <u>Blaker et al.</u> dose not teach the normalizing the total probabilities, however <u>Hladik et al.</u> teaches the normalizing the total probabilities (column 6 lines 49-63, column 8 lines 7-10 step (ii), column 9 lines 40-52). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have the normalization in Blaker et al.'s method to have better performance and efficient memory usage (column 2 lines 11-14).

Regarding **claim 15,** except explicitly to specify the probability ratio, <u>Blaker et al.</u> teaches all subject matter claimed (refer to the rationale of claim 1), however <u>Hladik et al.</u> teaches probability ratios (column 5 lines 1-7) and logarithmic probabilities (column 5 lines 7-11) for the binary values. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have the probability ratio/ logarithmic probabilities taught by Hladik et al. in Blaker et al.'s method as typical SOVA calculation (column 4 lines 66-67) and to gain computational advantages (column 5 lines 7-8).

Regarding **claim 17,** Blaker et al. discloses a decoder to carry out the method (column 3 lines 38-50, FIG. 1).

Regarding **claim 18,** except explicitly specify two vectors of logarithmic probabilities for the symbol representing a binary one or zero, <u>Blaker et al.'s</u> method has all the subject matter claimed (refer to the rationale of claim 1): updating fro successive symbol times tow vectors (receiving series of binary data, column 3 lines 48-50); determining probabilities for each state; combining the probabilities to determine the probability of reaching the state (column 3 lines 65-67); merging probability vectors for the respective states; and determining a probability at the start of the survivor path for all the possible states at a respective information symbol time

(column 4 lines 2-20, lines 28-36); and Blaker et al. disclose the symbol instant/time, and all the well known basic Viterbi algorithm steps claimed. However Hladik et al. teaches the binary representing symbol probabilities (column 5 lines 1-15). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have the probabilities representing binary zero and one taught by Hladik et al. in Blaker et al.'s method as typical SOVA calculation (column 4 lines 66-67) and to gain computational advantages (column 5 lines 7-8).

Regarding **claim 19**, Blaker et al. dose not teach the normalizing the total probabilities, however Hladik et al. teaches the normalizing the total probabilities (column 6 lines 49-63, column 8 lines 7-10 step (ii), column 9 lines 40-52). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have the normalization in Blaker et al.'s method to have better performance and efficient memory usage (column 2 lines 11-14).

Regarding **claim 20**, Blaker et al. discloses a decoder to carry out the method (column 3 lines 38-50, FIG. 1).

3.   Claims 12 & 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blaker et al. (US 5550870) in view of in view of Hladik et al. (U.S. Patent 5721745) as applied to claims 10 and 8 above, and further in view of Belveze et al. (U.S. Patent 6389574 B1).

Regarding **claims 12 & 13**, Blaker et al. does not explicitly specify the Q-ary, further Belveze et al. teach the Q-uplet of symbols (column 3 lines 15-20, column 6 lines 5-10) where Q is an integer at least equal to 1. When Q=1 it is the binary (M-ary where M is 2) wherein q=2. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have the Q-uplet teaching by Belveze et al. in Blaker et al.'s method to detect a discrete symbol sequence from an observation signal the production of which can be described by means of a

trellis states and branceds being associated with a single Q-uplet of discrete symbol (column 3 lines 15-20).

Response to Remarks

4.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

5.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edith M Chang whose telephone number is 703-305-3416. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Chin can be reached on 703-305-4714. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9314.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4800.

Edith Chang
December 16, 2003

CHIEH M. FAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER